

Date: Sat, 4 Dec 93 04:30:23 PST  
From: Ham-Equip Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-equip@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Equip-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Equip@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Equip Digest V93 #121  
To: Ham-Equip

Ham-Equip Digest                      Sat, 4 Dec 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 121

Today's Topics:

                    AH-2 versus AH-3  
          comments on FT990/IC765/TS850  
          ENTRY-LEVEL RIGS - RE  
entry-level rigs - recommendations?  
          Fox-Tango Newsletters  
          IC-22S help needed  
          New Ham 'bout to arrive  
PK-88 vs KPC-3 vs DPK-2 - Comments?  
          Ramsey FX-146 & FX-440  
          The new Yaesu 11 and 41 HTs  
          The TS 790E... price ?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Equip@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Equip-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Equip Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-equip".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 2 Dec 93 11:28:56 EET  
From: pipex!sunic!news.funet.fi!klaava!cc.helsinki.fi!mjokinen@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: AH-2 versus AH-3  
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

According to advices received in the newsgroup rec.boats automatic antenna tuner  
AH-2 is the right choice for IC-735 rig and single wire antenna (backstay of  
the boat). Unfortunately AH-2 is awfully expensive. May AH-3 be used instead (a  
used item has been offered second-hand)?

Matti Jokinen  
OH2 KX0

University of Helsinki

-----  
Date: Wed, 1 Dec 1993 09:24:59 GMT  
From: swrinde!emory!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!  
utnut!torn!nott!cunews!freenet.carleton.ca!Freenet.carleton.ca!  
aj467@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: comments on FT990/IC765/TS850  
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

In a previous article, cowart@convex.com (Michael Cowart) says:

>  
>I am in the market for a new rig. I have narrowed my choices to:  
>  
>FT-990, IC-765, and TS-850S  
>  
>I sure would appreciate any comments, good or bad.  
>  
>Thanks and 73,  
>  
>Mike

Personal Preference.

With DSP installed ... Kenwood 850  
Icom 765

Without DSP Yaesu 990  
Icom 765  
Yaesu 990  
Kenwood 850

This is the rationale

The Kenwood was designed with DSP in mind  
Set and forget / balanced AM / excellent SSB cutoff  
( with the DSP )

Yuck Ceramic IF Filters

Get the DSP and save the money from the optional  
filters

No DSP ... yuck

The Icom good audio ( not as good as DSP Kenwood  
better than the Yaesu ) More natural funtion to me  
than the Yaesu ( still run my Icom 701 )  
Yaesu not bad ... just nothing exceptional to me  
better than non DSP Kenwood

Conclusion ... the magic's in the DSP Unit  
The magic's in the Kenwood.

No DSP no magic.

--

Bill VE3NJV        Advanced Amateur  
Packet Address : VE3NJV@VE3KYT.#EON.ON.CAN  
Freenet Address: aj467@Freenet.Carleton.ca

-----  
Date: Thu, 02 Dec 93 19:53:31  
From: munnari.oz.au!yarrina.connect.com.au!harbinger.cc.monash.edu.au!msuinfo!  
agate!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!news-feed-2.peachnet.edu!concert!mms!  
dave.hockaday@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: ENTRY-LEVEL RIGS - RE  
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

NE>Path:  
NE>concert!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!emory!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!howland.reston.  
NE>.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!cs.uiuc.edu!news1.oakland.edu!vela.acs.oakland.edu!p  
NE>lko  
NE>From: prvalko@vela.acs.oakland.edu (prvalko)  
NE>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.equipment  
NE>Subject: Re: entry-level rigs - recommendations?  
NE>Date: 1 Dec 1993 18:02:42 GMT  
NE>Organization: Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan, U.S.A.  
NE>Lines: 18  
NE>Message-ID: <2dim82\$i4p@oak.oakland.edu>  
NE>References: <CHD1n3.BJ6@raster.Kodak.COM>  
NE>NNTP-Posting-Host: vela.acs.oakland.edu  
NE>X-Newsreader: TIN [version 1.2 PL0]

NE>Karl,

NE>Hahahah! Those are NOT entry-level rigs! hahahahaahah!!! You just  
NE>made my day!

NE>If you are getting your NOVICE license, look for a Heathkit HW-16 and  
NE>HG-10B VFO. That combination is an excellent "entry-level" radio at  
NE>under \$125. You can use it as you increase your code speed and turn  
NE>around and sell the thing for what you paid for it... THEN buy a radio  
NE>like the 707/890.

NE>If you have a couple hundred to spend on an "entry-level rig", look for  
NE>a used Ten Tec Century 21 at \$200-\$250. Agrueably the finest "novice"  
NE>level radio ever produced.

NE>Email me for more info. Congratulations!!!! 73 paul wb8zjl

The Heathkit HW-101 or SB-101 is a pretty good deal, too. (If you don't mind tube gear. 73 de WB4IUY

-----  
Date: 1 Dec 1993 18:02:42 GMT  
From: goanna.cs.rmit.oz.au!aggedor.rmit.EDU.AU!harbinger.cc.monash.edu.au!msuinfo!  
agate!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!cs.uiuc.edu!news1.oakland.edu!  
vela.acs.@munnnari.oz.au  
Subject: entry-level rigs - recommendations?  
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

Karl,

Hahahah! Those are NOT entry-level rigs! hahahahaahah!!! You just made my day!

If you are getting your NOVICE license, look for a Heathkit HW-16 and HG-10B VFO. That combination is an excellent "entry-level" radio at under \$125. You can use it as you increase your code speed and turn around and sell the thing for what you paid for it... THEN buy a radio like the 707/890.

If you have a couple hundred to spend on an "entry-level rig", look for a used Ten Tec Century 21 at \$200-\$250. Agrueably the finest "novice" level radio ever produced.

Email me for more info. Congratulations!!!! 73 paul wb8zjl

-----  
Date: 1 Dec 1993 19:41:45 GMT  
From: nntp.ucsb.edu!mustang.mst6.lanl.gov!nntp-server.caltech.edu!  
elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!  
newsserver.jvnc.net!netnews.upenn.edu!mipg.upenn.edu!yee@network  
Subject: Fox-Tango Newsletters  
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

The Fox Tango Newsletters which where about the old Yaesu 101 series are still available from IRC but at a fairly steep price. Would anybody be interested in going in for a group purchase? Inside, there are supposed to be all sorts of neat mods on the 101 series. For me, the price is a bit steep to go it alone but with a few interested parties, the price might just be doable.

--

Medical Image Processing Group | Conway Yee, N2JWQ  
411 Blockley Hall | EMAIL : yee@mipg.upenn.edu  
418 Service Drive | VOICE : 1 (215) 662-6780  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6021 (USA) | FAX : 1 (215) 898-9145

-----  
Date: Wed, 1 Dec 1993 10:11:33 GMT  
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!torn!nott!cunews!  
freenet.carleton.ca!Freenet.carleton.ca!ai389@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: IC-22S help needed  
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

In a previous article, kg7bk@indirect.com (Cecil Moore) says:

>Clint Hastings (hastings@dseg.ti.com) wrote:  
>: Does anyone have any ideas on how to extend the frequency  
>: range on this unit, down to say 144?  
>: thanks, clint KC7XX  
>  
>Clint, Quoting from TechnoLogic Concepts' IC22S modification notes,  
>"To unlock the PLL, remove D6, D7, and R38(connected to IC-1, pin 13)  
>from the PLL board and solder a jumper from pin 13 to pin 16 on IC-1."  
>This will allow simplex operation down to 144.72 with 15KHz spacing.  
>They sell a kit to allow repeater offsets and 5KHz spacing.  
>Their address is 1803 Mission St., Suite 308, Santa Cruz, CA 95060.  
>  
>73, Cecil, kg7bk@indirect.com  
>  
>  
Problem is the PACKET frequencies are 145.00, 145.01, 144.99, 144.97 etc,  
so that none of those mods will help get it working on packet. I have a  
ic-22s which I love as arig and have worked witha friend in the same  
situation (except he is technically competent) for a year and the `major`  
mods have just made the rig unstable on those freq below 145.00. 73`s

--

----- | Internet: ai389@Freenet.carleton.ca  
Tim Ray | AMPRnet: ve3xv@ve3xv.ampr.org[44.135.96.80]  
----- | : ve3xv@port.ve3xv.ampr.org[44.135.96.86]  
| AX.25 BBS: VE3XV@VE30SQ.#EON.CA.NA

-----  
Date: 3 Dec 93 17:32:10 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!msuinfo!arctic2!cravitma@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: New Ham 'bout to arrive  
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

In article <2dmlo1\$eij@umcc.umcc.umich.edu> hoagy@umcc.umcc.umich.edu (Matthew Rupert) writes:

>

>

>Q3: The hand-held transceivers I see on a few folks - these things actually  
> get any good distance, or are they limited to under 10 miles???  
> I just can't see a hand-held going over 5 miles. But, then again,  
> I'm thinking in terms of CB and non-repeater business radio.

My Radio Shack HTX-202 handheld (outputs about 3 watts) has been used successfully to hit repeaters about 40-60 miles away, and on simplex communications to a range of around 35 miles (with the standard rubber duckie antenna).

/MC (Still waiting for my ticket, 4 weeks and counting)

--

Matthew Cravit	"So I sent him to ask of the
Michigan State University	owl, if he's there, how to
East Lansing, MI 48825	loosen a jar from the nose
E-Mail: cravitma@cps.msu.edu	of a bear..."

-----  
Date: Wed, 1 Dec 1993 20:29:37 GMT  
From: ucsnews!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!uunet.ca!lhaven.UUmh.Ab.Ca!  
combdyn!lawrence@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: PK-88 vs KPC-3 vs DPK-2 - Comments?  
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

In article <CH9IHD.HBG@wang.com> djenkins@wang.com (Dave Jenkins) writes:  
>I am trying to decide between asking for a PK-88, KPC-3 or DPK-2. Some of  
>the relative merits that I know of include:

>

>KPC-3:	L	1	Y	Y	Y	Y	\$119.95
>	^	^	^	^	^	^	^
>							
>							+----- HRO Price
>							
>						+-----	Open squelch operation
>						+-----	TNC-2 Compatible
>						+-----	PBBS
>						+-----	WEFAX
>						+-----	Kiss Mode
>						+-----	12 Operation (L = Low power consumption)
>						+-----	

>1) The guy at HRO said it does KISS Mode but it didn't say in the catalog.

>2) "100% firmware compatability with TAPR TNC-2"  
> "★ TNC-2 Compatible ★ Runs all TNC-2proms"  
>3) \$31.95 optional board  
>

I own a KPC3, I went with the advice to get the cheapest TNC I could find... and at the time it was.

The Open Squelch operation is Software Carrier Detect.....which isn't recommended if to use it in low power consumption mode....since the processor is constantly polling the audio to check for a valid signal.

The option board for the DPK-2 is probably hardware that does carrier detect, which would probably draw less power.

The KPC-3 is maybe command set compatible, but it is not firmware compatible to TNC-2. Its proprietary stuff from Kantronics.

Yes, the KPC3 has KISS, I run my in that mode all the time now that I'm addicted to NOS. I'll probably continue to run it this way when I start running a BBS (I plan to run a BPQ switch so I can still run NOS with the BBS).

--

--EMAIL-----PHONE-----FAX-----  
| WORK: lawrence@combdyn.com | (403)529-2162 | (403)529-2516 | CallSign  
| HOME: dreamer@lhaven.uumh.ab.ca | (403)526-6019 | (403)529-5102 | VE6LKC  
-----  
disclamer = (working\_for && !representing) + (Combustion Dynamics Ltd.);

-----  
Date: 3 Dec 93 14:51:32 GMT  
From: ogicse!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Ramsey FX-146 & FX-440  
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Dec2.181427.25410@mnemosyne.cs.du.edu> rdavis@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Robert Davis) writes:

>  
>I have no direct experience ... but a friend of mine built the FX146 kit.  
>AARRGGHH.  
>The receiver is poor. No matter what he does to improve it, the receiver  
>just is not very sensitive. In comparison with two mter handhelds which  
>have be properly specced on a Motorola test set, he estimates the receiver  
>sensitivity at 1 microvolt for 20 db quieting. The Yaesu and Icom talkies  
>used for comparison were measured at 0.25 and 0.33 uv respectively.

Tell him to \*grossly\* spread the little coils connecting from the

S0-239 to the receive section, out to about a half an inch. Then he should get at least 0.5 uV for 20 db quieting. Tell him to also use a spectrum analyzer when tuning up the transmitter. If he's getting more than about 2.5 watts out, most of the power is very likely to be in spurs rather than on frequency. Mine looked like a comb on the analyzer when it made 5 watts. The older kits also didn't have PLL unlock protection and would attempt to transmit while the PLL was sweeping into lock from receive. Ramsey supposedly fixed this in the newer kits. There's a way to fix it on the older ones too, but that's a bit complex to explain here, and I sold mine last month and the docs went with it. You can make these things work OK, but it's a non-trivial exercise.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV	Where my job's going,	gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems	I don't know. It might	uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way	wind up in Mexico.	emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244	-NAFTA Blues	

-----

Date: Fri, 3 Dec 1993 00:54:12 GMT

From: yarrina.connect.com.au!harbinger.cc.monash.edu.au!msuinfo!uwm.edu!

spool.mu.edu!darwin.sura.net!udel!news.sprintlink.net!nic.hookup.net!news.kei.com!

ub!csn!qwerty-gw.fsl.munnari.oz.au

Subject: The new Yaesu 11 and 41 HTs

To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

oppedahl@panix.com (Carl Oppedahl) writes:

>I have seen ads in the last two QSTs for new Yaesu handhelds, each said  
>to be the smallest HT with a full keyboard. The 11 is a 2-meter rig,  
>the 41 is a 70-cm rig.

>Has anybody actually tried them out? Are there any "gotchas", like  
>missing features or capabilities that people have noticed?

I played with the 2m HT (someone I know got an early Christmas present :-)  
and it seems pretty nice. I'm pretty stuck on having a dual bander but  
this new Yaesu is attractive.

Lack of an external power jack seems like a problem but it has a nice little  
charger stand containing the power jack. For table top use the stand works  
well. With two stands you could mount one in your car for a nifty removable  
radio setup.

It has the best keypad of any small radio I've seen and is very easy to use.

The speaker quality is great and even with full volume doesn't distort very much.

I'm curious about battery life though...

Quent Johnson (n0wch@wa8zia.#neco.co.usa.na)

-----  
Date: 2 Dec 1993 12:41:10 GMT  
From: ghost.dsi.unimi.it!univ-lyon1.fr!elendir@tcgould.tn.cornell.edu  
Subject: The TS 790E... price ?  
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

Hello.

I just got my French C licence, and I was planning to buy a Kenwood 790E TRX. Does anybody have this device, and I am wondering how much it costs in US. Also, what do you think about it ? Good or average ?

Thanx for any piece of advice.

Vincent (I have no callsign yet, it's yet to be defined)

--  
PSG Vainqueurs de la coupe de France 1982, 1983, 1993  
PSG Champions de France 1985/86 1/2 Finaliste C3: 1993  
PSG PARIS SAINT GERMAIN FC --- NOTRE HISTOIRE DEVIENDRA LEGENDE.

-----  
Date: 3 Dec 93 14:59:31 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!spool.mu.edu!darwin.sura.net!haven.umd.edu!cville-srv.wam.umd.edu!ham@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

References <2dim82\$i4p@oak.oakland.edu>, <8476.2cfe2338@hayes.com>,  
<2dngp5\$mp4@oak.oakland.edu>p  
Subject : Re: entry-level rigs - recommendations?

As to the point of contention about the \$1000 boxes, there ARE some compromises. At a hamfest, you can get a used TS-120/130/180 for between \$300 and \$400. You can get a used 430S for \$450. You can get a used 520S, arguably one of the toughest radios ever made, for \$300. You can get into an IC-730 for roughly \$450, or a Yaesu FT-101 or FT-747 for around the same price

range.

For \$600+, you could get a Yaesu FT-757GX, an Icom IC-735, or a Kenwood TS-440S (no A/T). Add a power supply and ant tuner to any of these and you've got a station that I think that many of us out here would be proud to own and use, and enjoy immensely, for MANY, MANY years to come.

I didn't get tired of my TS-520S for six years, and I still have it. It's a great rig, and would be even better if it were general coverage, had a CW filter in it, or had the DS-1A 12 volt cord. So I bought my IC-735 because it could do all of the above and did the WARC bands.

Yes, I know of people (K3BEQ for one) who have DXCC Honor Roll #1 with nothing newer than a TS-830S that he's had for a LONG time.

--  
73,                   -----                   The  
          \ / Long    Original  
Scott Rosenfeld   Amateur Radio NF3I   Burtonsville, MD |   Live    \$5.00  
  WAC-CW/SSB   WAS   DXCC - 119 QSLed on dipoles -----| Dipoles! Antenna!

-----  
Date: Thu, 2 Dec 1993 21:15:29 GMT  
From: munnari.oz.au!uniwa!harbinger.cc.monash.edu.au!msuinfo!agate!netsys!pagesat!  
direct!herald.indirect.com!kg7bk@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-equip@ucsd.edu

References <CHBsrs.28w@herald.indirect.com>, <CHA32G.Iut@skopen.dseg.ti.com>,  
<CHCpnA.4DE@freenet.carleton.ca>ct  
Subject : Re: IC-22S help needed

Timothy Ray (ai389@Freenet.carleton.ca) wrote:

: In a previous article, kg7bk@indirect.com (Cecil Moore) says:

: >Clint Hastings (hastings@dseg.ti.com) wrote:  
: Problem is the PACKET frequencies are 145.00, 145.01, 144.99, 144.97 etc,  
: mods have just made the rig unstable on those freq below 145.00. 73's  
:       Tim Ray

Tim, after the mod, the PLL must be retuned for the new lock range and the tank circuits need to be peaked for the new range but that is easy. With the 5 KHz spacing mod, my IC22S has 672 channels from 144.62 to 147.99. The PLL is NOT stable for any 'N' numbers below 10 HEX...maybe that's your problem. But after the mod, my IC22S is stable from 00010000 to 11110000, where 1=diode and 0=blank. I've modified 4 units and they all work.

73, Cecil, kg7bk@indirect.com

-----

End of Ham-Equip Digest V93 #121

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\*